

IowaAccess Steering Committee
Meeting Summary ✧ June 19, 1997
Iowa Department of Education ✧ Des Moines, Iowa
US General Services Administration ✧ Washington DC
Cedar Falls High School ✧ Cedar Falls
Grinnell High School ✧ Grinnell
Indian Hills Community College ✧ Ottumwa

Members Attending

Jim Youngblood, Chair
Gerald Bair
Sally Cunningham (*for Charles Palmer*)
Cynthia Eisenhauer
Roger Gutmann
Sandy Holmes
Rep. Willard Jenkins
Sen. Mary Kramer
Bob Layton
Todd Linden
Larry Murphy
Mary Nelson
Sandy Scharf
Phil Smith
Gretchen Tegeler
Hon. Marsha Ternus
Col. John Tymeson (*for Gen. Roger Schultz*)
Grant Veeder
Paul Wieck

Guests

Norman Baker, IPERS
Dan Houlihan, Information Network of Kansas
Velma McCuiston, US Postal Service
Sam Sommerholder, Nebraska Online

ITS Staff

Linda Plazak
Lowell Sneller

ICN Staff

Harold Bowman

SPPG Staff

Amy Campbell
Gina Noll
Tom Slater

Introductions

Jim Youngblood opened the meeting with introductions, and noted that five new members have been invited to participate on the steering committee. Youngblood reviewed the mission and goals, as amended at the May 20 meeting. The Committee approved the Mission and Goals with the following changes:

- Add "intergovernmental" to the fifth steering committee goal
- Add "interbranch" to the first bullet of the State IT Advisory Board functions
- Add "interbranch and interdepartmental" to the fifth bullet of the State IT Advisory Board functions

The Committee suggested that the steering committee should take on a larger role in marketing the IowaAccess process and products around the state. *The Committee also suggested that staff outline any individual responsibilities for Steering Committee members -- things they should be doing to promote IowaAccess in their own communities and within their own spheres of influence.*

Secondary Role of the lowAccess Steering Committee

Youngblood pointed out the expansion of the role of the Steering Committee -- serving as the State Information Technology Advisory Board. Youngblood explained the structure, which includes several ad hoc committees that work on specific subgroups (i.e. legislative, judicial, executive, local, private).

The Committee discussed the proposed expansion of the Steering Committee's role. Youngblood reviewed the structure and the relationship with other efforts.

- To what extent does the Advisory Board set IT priorities in Executive branch?
Youngblood emphasized that each branch of government would continue to set their own priorities, and the Board would more appropriately address enterprise-wide issues that encourage cooperation, collaboration, and communication.
- Is the Steering Committee date-certain? Will the Advisory Board be more permanent?
Originally, the Steering Committee was appointed to serve the life of the projects -- until September, 1998. The Advisory Board proposed should be perceived as ongoing. The membership would continue as it is -- but its purpose would evolve.

Marsha Ternus remarked that the Advisory Board would not supplant any decision-making in any branch of government, but would be helpful in integrating services intergovernmentally and interdepartmentally. Youngblood agreed, and added that all branches of government will drive policy. However, this Board will help communicate these policies and act as a sounding board for those branches of government. This effort's main goal is to improve intergovernmental and interdepartmental communication -- and potentially encourage collaboration.

Gretchen Tegeler added that the Advisory Board would need to be very explicit in communicating the need to link with other existing groups to ensure coordination and maintain close relationships at all levels throughout state government.

Rep. Jenkins cautioned that the Advisory Board should not get too big -- and agreed that the ad hoc groups will be helpful and eventually could become permanent.

Sandy Scharf suggested that some Steering Committee members may need to check with their colleagues and oversight bodies to make sure it is okay to participate on the proposed Advisory Board. Scharf stated that he would need to have the approval of the Legislative Council before he could participate.

Youngblood agreed and asked all Steering Committee members to discuss this proposal with their colleagues, obtain necessary approvals, and review the proposed duties. The Steering Committee will take action on this proposal at the next meeting.

Operational Issues

Linda Plazak and Norman Baker, co-chairs of Project 1 (Citizen Information Network Support Structure), discussed the progress their team has made in determining a direction and structure for the overall Citizen Information Network (CIN).

Plazak explained that Project I will formulate the foundation and infrastructure for most of the lowAccess projects. Plazak emphasized that all projects have common issues and concerns that must be addressed, such as standards, security, and electronic transfer protocols. These issues must be addressed in the design of the overall support system of the CIN -- which is the responsibility of Project 1.

Plazak noted that the matrix included in the Steering Committee packets outlines 9 overriding issues to be addressed -- and denotes which projects are affected by each issue. Plazak asked the Steering Committee to comment on these categories, and noted that the Project Leads had already had chance to review this list. The Committee suggested adding the following:

- Add a column for "formal agreements required"

The Committee asked about digital signatures, and the need for a column for that issue. Plazak and Baker stated that digital signatures are covered in security column. Plazak noted that a one-page glossary is also included with the matrix, to make sure everyone has the same understanding of the issues presented.

Staff Issues

Tom Slater and Amy Campbell reviewed the outreach efforts planned in the upcoming months -- and emphasized the importance of a coordinated public information effort. Slater described the components of the outreach plan, including focus groups, surveys, and public meetings. Marketing Iowa's commitment to services to the citizen -- through the lowAccess effort -- will be a centerpoint in these meetings. The Steering Committee suggested the following approaches:

- Emphasize in every effort, outreach or marketing, Iowa's commitment to citizen services -- Iowa is taking a thoughtful, coordinated approach to investing in technology.
- Review existing resources from the federal level, such as national focus group results. In particular, staff should look at results from the National Performance Review and US Postal Service.
- Many departments collect information about services to citizens and gauge customer satisfaction with the services and customer support they receive from that particular agency. *Staff should ask department heads for any information like this -- and create a clearinghouse of public information about services to citizens.*
- Review the Iowa Supreme Court Plan for the 21st Century to get information about the judicial branch's activities and plans.

Phil Smith noted that he is working at federal level and with the National Governor's Association to market the Iowa effort. Smith is continuing to work on funding issues to continue some support for lowAccess.

Larry Murphy stated that he is currently conducting focus groups with the Department of Human Services, *and asked staff to provide him with appropriate questions to add to his questionnaire.*

Citizen Information Network Options & Opportunities

As noted in a prior presentation, Project Team 1 is responsible for creating the support structure for the Citizen Information Network. Project Team 1 is looking at several options for creating this framework -- and is looking at existing structures in other states to leverage expertise, eliminate duplicative efforts, and use funds judiciously.

Criteria for CIN

Linda Plazak outlined a proposed list of Objective Criteria, which provides a set of requirements for any network selected, and asked the Steering committee to comment on the proposed list. Plazak reiterated that this list will be used as guidance for the selection of a direction for the CIN -- and will provide baseline criteria for the network. The Committee made the following comments:

- Add "Incorporate feedback mechanisms to gauge user satisfaction and track public use of the network and specific applications on the network."
- The CIN should be more than a glorified home page -- and should link with the Electronic Commerce Plan.

Plazak suggested that the Steering Committee consider these criteria while they listen to the presentations -- and revisit them after the presentations are completed.

Framework for the CIN

Norman Baker stated that the project team had developed two charts that demonstrate the conceptual framework for the CIN -- one shows the overall structure of the CIN and the second shows how a citizen will access services using the CIN.

Baker added that the Internet will be used, but traffic would be diverted from the Internet onto a public network that incorporates higher degrees of security. This public network would be the pathway to all lowAccess projects (and subsequent electronic commerce applications). The network would be created to be flexible and allow for applications to be taken off and put on without redesigning the entire system.

Information Network of Kansas Presentation

Dan Houlihan, Vice-President of Operations for the Information Network of Kansas (INK), introduced himself and his Nebraska counterpart, Sam Sommerholder. Houlihan presented details about INK, its development, its purpose, and its organizational and operational structures. Houlihan also commented on how INK is funded and sustained.

- How do you offer electronically official documents that require an embossed seal?
After passing an electronic signature law, the State of Kansas began offering electronic UCC filings for banks. Therefore, the official UCC filing does not need to be signed, because of the electronic signatures are legally binding.
- What about documents coming from the State, such as a certified birth certificate?
Requests can be made electronically, and processing can be done electronically. However, the issuance of the birth certificate continues to be through the mail. A State could use a different sort of technology to identify official documents.

- The local government portion of your network seems to be purely informational -- Is there more to local government participation than just information sharing?
No -- Kansas has a comprehensive network of local governments that is constantly developing.
- As I understand it, in order to access your network, a user must pay a \$50 subscription fee. Is that correct?
Yes. There are two levels of services -- public and premium. To access these premium services, a user must set up a subscriber account on an annual basis. The user is given a user name and password that creates an electronic log of every transaction completed on the network. However, over 90% of the online services are free to the user.
- How do you get access to this system without local Internet access?
Internet access is not mandatory to access the system. The State has set up an 800 number to allow access to services.
- Where are the boundaries of this network? Can the system be accessed outside the state?
The network is a "virtual internet" -- meaning you are not location-controlled. A person can be anywhere in the world, get on the Internet, and access the network, if they have been authenticated for certain services. Businesses are authenticated the same as individuals, so they could be located out of state and continue to access information they are entitled to receive.

US Postal Service -- WINGS Presentation

Velma McCuiston, a representative from the US Postal Service, presented the WINGS (Web Interactive Network of Government Services) platform. Currently, WINGS is looking for additional pilot states that are advanced in their technology planning and implementation. McCuiston presented the WINGS infrastructure, platform, security features, authentication procedures, and costs per transaction. McCuiston briefly highlighted some of the results from a series of focus groups and surveys -- and outlined how that information was used in designing a customer-friendly system.

- Is authentication as easy as going to your local post office?
Yes. The US Postal Service has over 40,000 points of presence in the United States. Also, depending on level of security needed, the Postal Service will be able to provide multiple levels of authentication. The Postal Service wants to make sure that the people who own the information have control of the information. The agency that owns the information will be the entity that determines the level of authentication required (i.e. some may require social security numbers and two forms of ID, while others only require a photo ID).
- Have you considered the need to authenticate two types of customers -- business people and the general public? Given the public's distrust in government, how do you market this type of effort so that it addresses concerns about privacy and gains public trust?
This is a very appropriate question. The Postal Service found that government gains public trust by incrementally offering services that are high volume (highly used) and low risk (privacy may not be much of an issue) applications. For instance, paying utility bills electronically is a high volume, low risk application. Many people want the convenience of electronic payments -- but there is not much concern about someone paying another person's utility bill. So, privacy is not a large issue.

Review of Objective Criteria

The Committee revisited the objective criteria proposed by Project Team 1 (Citizen Information Network). The committee approved the proposed list as presented.

Project Reports

Project 7 (Business License Information Center, Regulation Guide, & Professional Licenses)

Mark Laurenzo and Roger Halvorson presented the three segments of their project. The Committee suggested that the team look at the National Performance Review (NPR), which has a business advisor component. Bob Layton commended the team for their work and *asked that they strengthen the intergovernmental component by working on broader applications.*

Project 4 (Internet Training Pilot)

Darlas Shockley highlighted project 4's scope and direction. The Committee commented that the project seems to emphasize training on how to use the Internet, but does not focus on using the Internet for transactions. Shockley replied that the project does emphasize training, but also addresses access to services on the Internet.

The Committee asked if the team would address access charges in rural communities. Shockley stated that the project would target folks who do not have or understand the Internet. The project may provide information on how to get connected to the Internet.

Project 5 (Local Government Online Budget & Tax System)

Jerry Reid outlined the project for team co-leaders Ron Amossen and Joel Lunde, who could not attend the meeting. Reid emphasized the progress made to date in implementing the project, and discussed the aggressive timeline for tests and full implementation. There were no questions from the Committee.

Project 9 (STAWRS)

Wayne Cooper described the STAWRS project and recent developments in project planning. Cooper briefly outlined the project timeline and identified the target audience. There were no questions from the Committee.

Project 11 (Environmental Permitting)

Elizabeth Henderson gave a brief overview of the project development to date, and emphasized that the project is continually evolving. Henderson noted that she was just added as a project co-lead on the team. The committee asked if the team has plans to add private sector representatives. Henderson said they do plan to add private sector representatives to the team -- and have done so with deference to geographic location.

Project 6 (Online Housing and Real Estate Information)

Bruce Ray discussed the online housing information project, and described the project proposed as an electronic information system that gives the public, communities, and private developers a laundry list of information about available housing and development assistance and programs.

The Committee asked if individuals would be able to access the information, then enroll electronically in programs or apply for assistance/loans electronically. Ray responded that they would be able to do this for certain programs.

The Committee asked if the public would be able to electronically track the status of applications. Ray stated that they would -- and the site would link them to the appropriate agency handling that application.

The Committee asked why the project was over budget, and Ray responded that he had not realized the budget had been cut from the amount outlined in the MOU. *Ray asked that staff clarify the amount available to the project team.*

Projects 2 & 3 (Internet Trainings & Materials)

Pam Johnson highlighted the project plan components and discussed the four targeted audience categories, which includes both the public and many levels of government employees.

The Committee asked if the project was looking at issues related to citizen access -- where will they access the Internet, and how will they be made aware of services offered online. Johnson replied that the team is looking at existing training materials that can be used and tested on persons that have not yet been trained. Part of this project is determining which materials work the best -- but this can only be done on a pilot scope because of the budget.

The Committee expressed concern that the Ottumwa project seemed to have addressed sustainability with a commitment for continuing training after lowAccess funding runs out -- but this project does not have a similar component and appears to have a small chance for sustainability.

Project 10 (Electronic Commerce Business Plan)

Cynthia Eisenhower identified the three products expected from this project, and described the RFI that was recently sent out to potential vendors. Eisenhower discussed the project timeline for reviewing the RFI, and added that the workplan and budget would be completed after a vendor is identified.

The Committee asked if there will be a "best practices" component in the RFI, and Eisenhower agreed that it would be a good addition.

Project 12 (Automated Booking Station)

Paul Wieck described the structure of project 12 and discussed the progress made in implementing the project plan. Using diagrams, Wieck demonstrated the interconnectivity of the system. Wieck added that this project is funded by a variety of funding sources, including GSA.

The Committee asked if the team was looking at the impact of recommendations made by the International Fugitive Task Force, which involves 14 different federal law enforcement agencies. Wieck answered that the project was quite comprehensive on the State level, and that it is controlled at the state level, with links to the Department of Justice database.

The Committee asked if the majority of funds would be spent on the three pilot sites -- or for the infrastructure to connect these sites. Wieck commented that the State will probably never set up all 99 counties on this system, because the cost-benefit analysis only works in 12-14 counties. However, Wieck stated that he expects to see counties funding themselves to come online. Some additional funds may be available to hook up additional counties after this cycle,

particularly after the pilot projects demonstrate efficiency and the infrastructure can be leveraged without additional spending.

Project 13 (Integrated MIS for Human Services)

Pat Brockett and Dave Gannon highlighted the progress their team has made in completing their project plans. The Committee had no questions.

Project 14 (Uniform Data Reporting for MH Services)

Harold Templeman briefly described the project and noted the team's progress in completing the project plan. The Committee commented that the *project does not seem to be on target as anticipated -- and appears to be moving in a different direction than outlined in the MOU. The Committee also asked for clarification on whether the project will develop software to operate a common database that interfaces with other databases.*

Project 8 (GIS)

The team leaders were not available at the meeting. *The Committee asked for clarification on the use of allocated funds, and expressed concern if a large portion of those funds is being used for coordinator salaries and other related administrative expenses.*

Adjournment

Youngblood thanked the Steering Committee members, project team leaders, and guests for their comments and attendance. Youngblood set the next meeting for July 18 (9 am - Noon) at a site to be announced.